20c DECEMBER 25, 1950

New Republic

Anna Rosenberg

CASE HISTORY OF A SMEAR

By ARNOLD HEIDENHEIMER

MOBILIZATION SHAPES UP

AN EDITORIAL

HAROLD L. ICKES ON:

A CHRISTMAS CARD FOR GENERAL MacARTHUR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Special Combination Offer

New Republic
52 issues
(regularly $6.50)

Harper's Magazine
12 issues
(regularly $5.00)

BOTH for only $8.50

Value $11.50

Two distinguished magazines, a weekly and a monthly, for little more than the price of one!

The *New Republic*, each week, appeals to citizens eager to keep abreast of significant news, to learn what's behind it, and what the future holds—social, economic, political. Independent, courageous, engagingly written by the foremost liberal journalists and thinkers.

Harper's Magazine is a general monthly famous for authoritative analysis and interpretation of contemporary affairs—political, social, and cultural—with first-rate fiction, verse and criticism.

Now you may subscribe to both at the low rate of only $8.50, provided they are ordered at the same time and payment is sent with your order. Subscriptions may be new or renewal and may be mailed to separate addresses. Foreign postage $2.50 extra, Canadian postage, $1.

NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

Please enter this magazine order:

One year of the *New Republic* and *Harper's Magazine* for $8.50, for which I enclose payment. (Foreign and Canadian Postage Extra.)

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

_____

12/25/50

Order Today—

while this low combination rate is in effect! We cannot guarantee this price after September 30.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR DEC. 25, 1950

5 Mobilizing Short of War, An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 Working for Peace
7 Monopoly by Merger
7 Railway Strike
8 Tito Found Good Risk
8 Jim Crow Wins in Oregon
8 AMA's Trojan Gift
9 Civil Defense
10 Outside America
11 The Frustration of Unification
13 "Say Not That Thousands Are Gone"
15 Case History of a Smear, by Arnold Heidenheimer
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 The Hinge of Fate, reviewed by James R. Newman
19 Portrait of Mao, by Conrad Brandt
20 Postscript and Epitaph, by Morton Dauwen Zabel
20 Fiction Parade, by Jean Garrigue
21 On the Air
22 Theatre
22 Movies

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTER: Jean Begeman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1950, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

THIS COLUMN, deliberately and reluctantly, sets down its opinion that the global odds have shifted and that chances of war are now somewhat greater than those of peace. Until recently we have not thought so, but there has been a toughening of the Soviet line. As a matter of fact, we may be fairly close to war now. It may not be the kind of all-out war you visualize. We are fighting already in Korea, and the new situation might merely spread and thicken.

No side can ever be 100 percent right in world affairs. We can take some prayerful comfort from the fact that we are on the side of democratic freedoms which have generally won wars in the last 2,000 years and that Russia represents totalitarian aggression which has generally lost.

We will probably put the appointment of General Eisenhower as supreme commander into the European kitty soon. Object is to show hesitant Europeans that we mean business and bring back wandering American minds to the chief trouble focus, which is Europe not Asia. The timing of Ike's appointment is a gamble. Originally Acheson's planners figured we had four or five years to ready Europe and ourselves; now Korea has hurried everything up. That's why the German rearmament proposal was sprung so soon—before France or Germany was prepared for it. The fact that it was done this way indicates the official feeling of urgency.

Governor Dewey has been patriotically co-operating with the White House. He vainly tried to head off the GOP Congressional condemnation of Acheson. His speech last week preceding Truman's broadcast was cleared with Truman. An amusing aspect is that a "ghost" who worked on Truman's speech was wafted to Albany to make suggestions on Dewey's. Cordiality surrounded this patriotic collaboration. A word should be said, too, about John Foster Dulles. He has been brought back to Washington from UN and, more and more, becomes the channel of communication between the State Department and Taft Republicans on foreign affairs. Ultimately he might even become Secretary of State. Dulles has been privately critical of MacArthur. His record was good on warning against traps in the Korean episode. In view of foresight in Korea, some weight must be given Dulles' private reservations against piecemeal commitment of US troops in Europe. The Soviet could gobble them up if it went all out, he feels, as Mao did in Korea. There is danger, he cautions, in too little too soon; should we not first build up our total strength?

The GOP Congressional rank-and-file spurned Dewey leadership and formally condemned Acheson, and, oh, the pity of it! What is there to say? The GOP is deeply divided on foreign policy; it only agrees in condemning Acheson. It stabbed him in the back just as he went on a crucial foreign mission. Maybe it does no good to stress the point, but ultimately this comes back to our form of government: a system of divided powers instead of the parliamentary system which insists on party responsibility. Our antiquated system weakens us, killed the League of Nations, fosters McCarthys and ultimately may wreck America.

Numerically, the readers of this column, we are given to understand, are somewhat less than the listeners to Fulton Lewis Jr, a chief Acheson-hater. Fanatical Lewis supporters are now piling up batches of violent "get-Acheson" letters in Congressional mail bags. Has it ever occurred to you that you can write, too; that writing a letter to a Senator is as easy as writing a Christmas card? How do you feel about the GOP condemnation of America's foreign secretary as he hurried to the crucial Brussels'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference? Of course, you don't *have* to write; your Senator will be hearing from Fulton anyway.

On the subject of inflation we think this magazine is pretty much in the clear. We saw it coming and said voluntary controls wouldn't work. Unfortunately we were right. This column now adds its own view that even compulsory controls will bog down, too, after a time unless they are backed up by more taxation than Congress at present shows any disposition to enact.

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who now becomes Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of mobilization problems, has undergone the customary advance villification reserved for those who accept patriotic service. She is a woman, a liberal, foreign-born and a Jew, therefore fair game for attack. The charges collapsed leaving only a smell, and Fulton Lewis and Joe McCarthy hastily washing their hands. Chief-accuser Freedman in New York charges that Lewis-McCarthy legmen came to him bearing introductions from Christian Fronter, Gerald L. K. Smith, but this is denied. Now everything is jolly again, and even McCarthy says he is going to vote for confirmation. All that remains is another driblet of poison virus in the minds of millions who will never be aware of refutation of the charges and whose confidence in their Government is weakened as Stalin wants.

Notes: Hints come from the Pentagon that, "We're going to do something about MacArthur." . . . John Hersey's current *New Yorker* piece spells out press association irresponsibility which we briefly covered regarding Truman's famous A-bomb press conference. . . . Democratic Senators will probably choose amiable, middle-of-the-road McFarland rather than New Dealer O'Mahoney as leader; continuing issue is whether the party stays liberal. . . . Ex-New York Lieut-Gov. Joe Hanley got his $16,000 state job from Dewey just as he was promised. . . . Hail to the AMA, most successful trade union in the country. Because of its strangling of US aid to medical schools, only one doctor is now graduating for each 27,000 citizens—in 1910 it was one for 20,000.

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

The UN Flag

SIR: While politicians and political organizations sonorously sound off on all aspects of the world situation, a strange kind of international policy for this country is being fashioned at the grass-roots level by our old guardians of American virtue—the self-appointed assortment of "patriotic organizations."

While liberals fiercely debate each new issue within the safe sanctuary of their branches and chapters, pressure is being applied where pressure counts—by the "regents" and the posts in all towns and cities of the United States. And in the biggest town of all, New York City, a fierce debate has centered around the "Marshall" resolution now before the Board of Education which provides for the display of the UN flag in the public schools on appropriate occasions.

Proponents and opponents have both strayed from the original intent of Mr. Marshall's resolution; at issue is the United Nations and the role of the US in the UN. New York City newspapers, either through ignorance . . . or fear . . . of offending certain vested interests, avoided the real issue at stake. Favoring the resolution are the Public Education Association, Anti-Defamation League, Spanish-American Youth Bureau, Citizens' Union, League of Women Voters, American Jewish Committee, CIO of NYC, Liberal Party, Church Peace Union, Council for Community Action, American Veterans Committee, ADA, National Council of Jewish Women, Womens Trade Union League and other similar groups.

Violently opposed to this resolution are the DAR, National Society for Constitutional Security, Queens County American Legion, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Defenders of the American Constitution, National Society of Dames of the Court of Honor, US Flag Foundation, Catholic War Veterans, Committee for the Restoration of the Republic and the Minute Women of New York. Arguments of the UN haters include:

1. We came over on the Mayflower; we made our flag in 1776; we are real Americans and want no other flags seen in New York.

2. Only prayer can bring about peace. Let's bring the Lord's prayer and the Bible back into the public schools.

3. The UN is not composed of Christians; it includes Indians, Hindus, Moslems, people who are not like us.

4. The UN got us into Korea; the Communists are in the UN, and they are our enemies.

5. Let's bring all our boys home by Christmas; then give A-bombs to all our aviators to drop all over the world.

6. Anyone who favors the UN is not an American; all of them should go back where they came from.

I wish I were making all of this up. Unfortunately this is an unvarnished outline of the hate, bigotry and insanity spewed forth by the pleasant old ladies and the not so pleasant old American Legion bullies who are leading the opposition.

New York City MICKEY LEVINE

The Taft Victory

SIR: Your November 20 issue suggests these reasons for the Taft victory: (1) World crisis; (2) labor failed to present its case and/or "bludgeoned" its members; (3) the electorate's resentment of activity of union leaders.

Isn't it possible that a more important reason was in the Democrats' choice of a candidate? Many voters must have protested at having such mediocrity forced on them. Their only course was to vote *against* Taft—surely not *for* Ferguson.

The cause of a liberal Democrat might well be furthered if he "goes fishing" and lets the Tafts and Deweys win—no one has accused them of mediocrity or incompetence—until candidates of which one can be proud are available. How serious does the situation have to get before labor's leaders get smarter? . . .

Houston, Texas R. A. CHILDERS

"Did Hitler Win"

SIR: I just read in your issue of November 2 the article "Did Hitler Win," by the Rev. A. Powell Davies.

I consider it as pertinent, vital and revealing as any article I have ever read in any magazine.

I suggest you reprint that article in a small pamphlet for 5 or 10 cents apiece.

Every member of Congress, every state legislator and every big, public official should get a free copy. I hereby put in my order for 100 copies to begin with.

New York City JAMES E. PHILLIPS

NR'y Christmas

SIR: I would love to send your wonderful magazine to all my friends for Christmas, but unfortunately I can't afford to do so since I have so much expense in medical school. Some day I hope to be able to. Anyway I wish you good luck on your magazine's future.

St. Louis, Mo. D. E. STARRETT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 123, NUMBER 26, ISSUE 1882, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 25, 1950

New Republic

MOBILIZING SHORT OF WAR

PRESIDENT Truman was careful to state in his address to the nation preceding declaration of a national emergency that, "We still do not believe that war is inevitable. We are ready, as we have always been, to take part in efforts to reach a peaceful solution . . ."

The new stage of mobilization into which the United States is about to move is in line with this stated policy. Secretary of Defense Marshall, in explaining his opposition to vastly extended war preparations now, recently told the House Appropriations Committee that, "I would feel very much concerned if we plunged into an all-out wartime mobilization until we clearly have to do it." "At the same time," General Marshall added, "I would be even more concerned if we did not establish a well-laid foundation and base for a very rapid mobilization if that becomes necessary."

It is in an effort to achieve "effective, though partial" mobilization that President Truman has declared a state of national emergency and accelerated defense planning in the Government. While efforts are continued to negotiate for peace, the Administration will also seek to step up production of the equipment and supplies needed for larger armed forces for ourselves and our Allies. To do this without ringing ruinous inflation down on the country in the process will require a degree of public support and national unity that have been entirely lacking in the Korean crisis up to this time. The President's hope was that by declaring that a national emergency exists and by appealing to every citizen "to put aside his personal interest for the good of our country" he might create that kind of support.

The response to the President's appeal has not been electric. Enthusiasm for what may be long years of sacrifice ahead is understandably lacking. Young men will go into the armed forces when they are called. Goods in ever-increasing quantities will be produced by workers who will submit to longer hours and stabilization of their wages. But mobilization of this country for a needed high level of defense production, without the urgency of war as a stimulus, will be a heavy task. To stimulate the nation to arm itself and its Allies safely without deepening hysteria in the process requires a quality of leadership far beyond that which Mr. Truman has displayed in the past. During the months of this last unhappy summer, he allowed the country to drift without economic plan or purpose. More hope than work went into keeping production and inflation in balance. This last week as the tensions in the world have mounted, however, the President has shown heartening signs of listening to advice he previously disregarded as to what effective mobilization means.

If the steps the President has taken this last week are backed up with consistent action, it is possible that this nation can construct a solid base for a full war mobilization in case of necessity without so distorting the economy as to press us in frustration, into war.

The President has moved to establish a central authority for defense mobilization in the Government.

He has appealed to the Republicans for party unity in this emergency.

He has shown that he understands the need for wide public support of the mobilization program.

A multitude of smaller moves will determine how meaningful these first steps actually are.

The appointment of Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Company and the vice-chairman of the World War II War Production Board, to head an Office of Defense Mobilization with powers greater than ever before given to any American official except the President in time of peace, is in line with the best advice of experienced experts in the Government. The creation of such a central authority over Government operations relating to production, manpower, prices, wages, transportation and procurement was necessary for an orderly budgeting of our resources and requirements. Now it should be possible to make the decisions which have been needed for so many months on how best to divide what we can produce as between military and civilian needs, and investment in industrial buildup and foreign aid. There has been no such determination to date.

With an economic plan of this kind in hand, it will be possible to know precisely what Government controls are needed and when. We do not know now. We must find out fast and move toward stabilization of the cost of living as quickly as it is feasible administratively. That means as quickly as capable people can be found in suffi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cient number to man the price control, production and manpower offices which need to be established. These preparations for economic controls should have been made long ago. But that is no argument for rushing into a full freeze of the economy immediately in order to appear vigorous. The present lack of preparation must not be tolerated as an excuse for further lagging, however. The Economic Stabilization Agency should freeze prices at once on certain critical items which are straining the national defense budget or the housewife's purse unbearably. What was done in the case of automobiles can be repeated to prevent further price rises on steel, petroleum, copper, lead, zinc and rubber and to prevent additional markups on certain foods can be made to stick even before full control machinery is set up. Some major items in the food budget cannot be controlled under the present Defense Production Act because it provides that wholesale prices must rise above parity before ceilings can be applied.

Charles E. Wilson has a head start in his mobilization experience from World War II. It remains to be seen whether he is the organizer required for this new task. There is no going operation into which he can step as he did in the General Electric Company. The mobilization of America's strength calls for more than an ad-hoc operator. The well-intentioned Stuart Symington, an outstanding success as a corporation executive, demonstrated the limitations of present-day business experience when the job he was given at the National Security Resources Board called for building something new instead of managing a going concern.

Wilson's success will depend heavily on the calibre of the supporting personnel he brings in. Truman has not been able to attract good men to Government in the past. The war threat gives Wilson a new selling point. Will he use it to attract back to Government men like Robert Nathan, Chester Bowles, Wilson Wyatt and Paul Porter? Or will he turn to the John Hancocks and Ferdinand Eberstadts who opposed the wrong things last time. A whole team of good men will have to be recruited for the second and the third as well as the first layer to insure that mobilization will strengthen instead of weaken us in the long run.

Thomas E. Dewey has responded to the President's call for unity between the parties with understanding. The Republican leader in Congress, Senator Taft, has taken the opposite tack. Commenting on the President's request for continuous consultation with GOP leaders during the emergency, Taft told a Republican caucus: "I see no reason to consult as long as Harry Truman is in the White House. . . The role of the Republicans should be to criticize." Unity between the parties will have to flow from more public-spirited Republicans than Taft.

Mr. Truman's bid for wide public support in his most recent radio address must be followed by continuing concern that Americans generally understand what their Government's policies are and how those policies will contribute to a better future. Honest effort to equalize the sacrifices in regard to taxes will help inspire confidence. But an effective mobilization for defense depends on the ability of the Government to state the national objectives behind our present mobilization so that they have meaning and force for the men and women who must do the fighting, producing and sacrificing it demands.

THE WEEK

WORKING FOR PEACE

LAKE SUCCESS (NR correspondent)

For the historical record, it should be noted that last week the United Nations Assembly took action looking toward the end of the war in Korea. It was the first important step of this character since the Russians came back into the UN and thereby re-established the Big-Power veto in the Security Council. It was also the first concrete action under the plan, originally sponsored by the US, to make the Assembly rather than the Security Council the heart of the peace machinery.

It must also be noted for the record that the action for peace was taken in an atmosphere of gloom if not defeatism. Even though this first step did no more than authorize the President of the Assembly to create a committee of himself and two others to find a basis for a possible cease-fire, there was no discernible hope that it would be effective. More important than the formal proceedings under the gray-green fluorescent lights in the conference room were the series of many talks between small groups seeking to find some possible basis for actually putting an end to the war.

Honesty compels the report that the attitude of the United States at this moment is not popular at Lake Success—far less popular, in fact, than most of the delegates are willing to admit, on the record. It is ironic that while the Wherrys and the Knowlands continue to attack Truman and Acheson as appeasers, most of the delegates representing the democratic world at Lake Success consider these American officials to be much too stubborn and unyielding in their attitude. The delegates do not want to "appease" Communist China—a semantic word which badly needs to be defined

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and clarified. The point they make is that there are only two ways to end a war: by unconditional surrender, and by negotiation. Nobody wants the UN forces in Korea to surrender unconditionally; therefore, we must, at some point, negotiate. Yet the United States, at least as viewed from Lake Success, has been insisting on impossible conditions for the beginning of negotiations. Washington does not seem to realize, according to this view, that the UN army is taking "one hell of a licking." We seem still to have the psychology of the victor, whereas there is no doubt that if Communist China wants to, she can make our continued foothold on the Korean Peninsula unendurably expensive.

In short, there are three major viewpoints at Lake Success: those of the Communist bloc, of the United States and of the majority of the other members of the UN. This majority feels that it is tied perforce to the American chariot wheel for many reasons, among which are our overwhelming economic strength and our military potential. It agrees with us about the immorality of aggression such as occurred in Korea last June. It wants the UN to be in a position to halt such aggression in the future. It feels, however, that the position of the US is not a pure UN position; that men like Wherry and Knowland are activated partly by a desire for the unilateral use of American power and that Acheson and Truman are to some degree the prisoners of the Wherrys and Knowlands. The UN delegates believe that this situation brings closer the danger of a third world war.

Again for the historical record, it might be noted that the Assembly, in the closing days before its recess, failed to do anything about Southwest Africa; failed to do anything about the holy places in Jerusalem; talked about combining the study of atomic weapons and of conventional armaments; and ignored a third plea for help from Tibet. It prepared to ask Russia what ever became of the two million German, Italian and Japanese war prisoners. The World Health Organization is going to study alcoholism, and will tell the inhabitants of tropical countries about a new drug which seems effective against leprosy. Some of these are extremely useful enterprises; it is only against the background of Korean War and the threat of world war that they inevitably seem somewhat academic and remote.

MONOPOLY BY MERGER

For the last 50 years, every US President has expressed deep concern over the growing power of the giant industrial combines. Economic concentration —the trusts and monopolies—have been attacked since the industrial revolution began.

But Congress has done very little about monopoly since it passed the Clayton Anti-Trust Act in 1914 which made it illegal for one corporation to acquire the stock of another "where the effect . . . may be to substantially lessen competition. . . ." They might as well have passed a law against sin. Instead of buying the *stock*, the big corporations merely bought the *assets* of smaller corporations. This loophole stayed in the law for 36 years. It took a lame-duck session of the 81st Congress to plug it up. At least the Senate last week passed, 55 to 22, a bill to do the job. The House had already passed a companion bill early last year, and Capitol Hill observers seem to think it will become law before Congress adjourns this month.

Pessimists may ask: what's the difference? One-tenth of one percent of all corporations already control nearly half of all corporate assets, while 99.9 percent control the other half. Two percent of the corporations control 78 percent, 8 percent control nearly 90 percent. Aren't we just a little bit too late? Proponents of the bill look at it differently. It's better to have the degree of concentration that we now have than to have it continue to go up. Furthermore, with new enterprises constantly arising, the result may possibly mean a gradual diffusion of economic power and more competition.

In view of all the work involved in beating down attempts to weaken antitrust laws, it is a pleasant change to make some progress toward strengthening them.

RAILWAY STRIKE

Failure of Government officials successfully to mediate the railway labor dispute which brought about seizure of the lines last August 25 was the cause of the recent railroad strikes. Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman and the National Railroad Mediation Board have had four months—seemingly more than enough time—to effect an agreement between the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the operators. The mediators do not seem to have attached proper seriousness to the danger of a transportation shut-down in the midst of the Korean crisis.

One can hardly blame the members of the BRT for losing patience at so long a delay in the settlement of their just grievances. Approximately one million non-operating railway employees have been enjoying 48-hours' pay for 40-hours' work for more than a year now, while railroad men who belong to the BRT union have continued to work alongside them in the same yards at the old 40-hour pay rate. The trainmen have also seen millions of industrial workers win pay increases even before their contracts expired.

American labor history shows that nationwide labor stoppages as extensive as those now occurring on the railroads have customarily occasioned Presidential action. From Wilson to Roosevelt, the usual course has been for the President personally to call in the leaders of the unions and the railroads. In 1941, just before Pearl Harbor, Franklin Roosevelt averted what might have been a disastrous railroad shutdown by appointing Wayne Morse as special mediator. A 69-hour session in that case produced agreement and prevented the strike. Failure to follow the historic formula for settlement led to the costly railroad strike of 1946.

It was only after the President's state of emergency message that Steelman, on Sunday night, brought union and management executives together for their first joint meeting since last August. Settlement appears likely at this writing, but will the President always have an emergency address ready when John Steelman muddles?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TITO FOUND GOOD RISK

Spurred by a crisis mood which has made the US much less choosy in finding its allies, the Congress easily passed a $38-million aid bill for Yugoslavia to provide food for that anti-Soviet bastion. There was some talk during the debate about the US plane the Yugoslavs shot down several years ago and their lack of religious freedom, but the picture of Tito's reported 32 divisions ready to fight on our side was enticing enough to hold the isolationists to only 21 votes on the final Senate roll call.

The closest the Republicans came to scuttling the program was the 42 to 38 vote on an amendment by Sen. William Knowland (R, Cal.) which would have forced attaching an "Aid to Chiang Kai-shek" string to the bill. Knowland's proposal to halt aid to Tito until Chiang is fed was backed by all but five GOP Senators—Aiken (Vt.), Flanders (Vt.), Smith (Me.), Tobey (N. H.) and Wiley (Wis.).

The GOP "Asialationists" were joined by four Democrats, including Sen. Pat McCarran (Nev.), who denounced Tito as a "brigand and murderer of the first order [who is] destroying every phase of godliness there is in his country," and Sen. John McClellan (Ark.) whose comment on the provision that 50 percent of the aid be required to travel in American ships was: "Why not make it 100 percent? If we are to fly our flag over there, why not let the people over there see it as often as possible."

The backhanded GOP attack was characterized by the remarks of Sen. Robert Taft (R, Ohio), the Party's reputed intellectual. "Many Senators," he said, "may hesitate to vote for aid to a man who has killed American boys, who murdered Mikhailovich, unless the Senate is prepared to adopt as part of a general policy, that Nationalist China be treated in the same way."

The Senate vote on the Knowland amendment indicated a deplorable falling away of usually responsible Republicans. Of the GOP members of the Foreign Relations Committee, most of whom have given fairly consistent support to bi-partisan policy legislation in the past, only Sen. Alexander Wiley (Wis.) resisted the "Asialationists'" call on this ballot. Of the five Republican Senators with the best foreign policy records during this Congress, three—Morse (Ore.), Smith (N. J.), and Ives (N.Y.)—followed Knowland's line, and Lodge (Mass.) abstained. While this vote cannot be regarded as a full-scale test of Administration strength, it is disturbing to note that if the same issue were to have been voted on next month—when four of the supporting Democrats will be replaced by isolationist victors in the November elections—the crucial aid program to Yugoslavia would have been defeated by the China lobby's hamstrings.

In the House, which passed the bill by a still narrower final vote of 225-142, and where Vito Marcantonio (ALP, N. Y.) ironically cast his swan-song vote against Communist Tito, the responsible note of needed realism was best sounded by Jacob Javits (R, N. Y.): "What we are doing is to . . . give the United States Government an opportunity to make this aid to Tito as useful to us in our struggle against the Communists as possible, and to make it as harmful to the Kremlin as possible."

JIM CROW WINS IN OREGON

PORTLAND, ORE. (NR correspondent)

For the first time in American history, the issue of civil rights was decided by popular vote on November 7. The electorate of Portland, Ore., narrowly rejected an ordinance forbidding discrimination in public places because of a person's color—76,444 votes to 61,058.

The civil-rights bill fared far better in wealthy, upper-class neighborhoods than in districts inhabited largely by working men and women. Analysis of the vote by precincts shows a slender favorable margin in heights areas where the average assessed valuation of homes is approximately $12,000. A number of working-class districts defeated the ordinance by margins exceeding 2 to 1. The traditionally Republican *Oregonian,* whose influence is infinitely greater among conservatives than among working people, led the campaign for civil rights. The restaurant and tavern owners and realtors opposing the ordinance maintained that property values would diminish because of contiguity to Negroes. This danger did not appear too imminent to people with impressive estates and mansions.

Because Portland is a conservative city which returned lop-sided Republican majorities last month, the civil-rights result is generally considered a favorable sign. The narrow rejection of the ordinance contrasted notably with the nearly 3-to-1 beating inflicted on a statewide FEPC bill in California in 1946. And the question of social equality is generally more loaded with political dynamite than that of parity in jobs.

It is probable that the sponsors of civil rights will try again. This measure reached the ballot after its unanimous passage by the city council. Beer parlors, hotels and restaurants then invoked the referendum because the bill threatened their privilege of ousting Negro patrons. Next time, the friends of civil rights probably will take the initiative in placing the measure before the electorate.

THE AMA'S TROJAN GIFT

The American Medical Association announced recently that it would contribute $500,000 to the 79 accredited medical schools in the nation. The sum was only a fraction of the $3.6 million collected from the AMA this year in $25 assessments from physicians. But it was the best the AMA could do, considering that the balance of the sum had been used up for lobbying expenses and the October advertising campaign against the President's health insurance program.

The donation was obviously designed to offset criticism of the doctor lobby for having blocked the aid to medical education bill which passed the Senate early this year but was shelved by a House committee when the AMA announced its opposition. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the AMA Board of Trustees, admitted that the $500,000 wouldn't "build very much," but he said, "We hope the idea will get going like a snowball down hill, perhaps even starting a chain reaction in American life against federal subsidies and federal control."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Senate-passed medical education bill would have established a $250-million emergency five-year program to increase the supply of doctors, nurses and personnel trained in dentistry, hospital administration and public health. Construction grants would be made for establishing new schools and expanding existing ones, and medical colleges would receive grants to meet the costs of instruction with incentives for increasing enrolments. The President urged action on this bill during the special session on the grounds that the defense programs and civil defense needs make it more urgent than ever before. Rep. Andrew Biemiller (D, Wis.), author of the House bill, points out that "the AMA donation is about one percent of the minimum needs of American medical schools, and there are no more private donations in sight. It is a Trojan gift serving no purpose but that of fatal indecision and inaction."

CIVIL DEFENSE BEGINS

Spurred by sudden hysteria over possible air attacks on the nation's cities, federal officials are trying to rush delayed preparations for civil defense. Several Congressional committees are examining the Administration's plan to set up an independent Civil Defense Administration under former Florida Governor Millard Caldwell, as well as a proposal to provide $190 million for the dispersal of Government offices through the Virginia and Maryland countrysides. Locally, many cities and states are building their own organizations into operating concerns.

But the going is slow, and the country is far from prepared against attack. What fault there is lies with the entire country, lulled into five years of life-as-usual. But, behind the scenes, responsible officials have been trading bitter recriminations.

The strongest attack came from the American Municipal Association, a powerful group representing 10,000 city and town administrations. The mayors were up in arms over lack of plans and assistance on civil defense and bitterly attacked the outline program finally presented to Congress. Federal officials retorted that the cities were waiting for Washington to do everything for them, including paying all the bills, and pointed to the few cities like Chicago, Seattle and New York which have gone ahead to set up the skeleton organizations recommended by the experts.

The showdown came at the American Municipal Association's Civil Defense luncheon meeting December 6. Administrator Caldwell put in a brief appearance, begged off because of the pressure of work and left the floor to his aide, James J. Wadsworth, whose speech took the form of an open and caustic attack on "dissenters" who shirked "their responsibilities to their own people." In his fervor, he scarcely mentioned his own agency's handicap in having had only a limited $1.2-million appropriation while preparing the blueprints necessary for a huge and complicated national program.

The city officials struck back hard. Led by able, young Richard Graves, secretary of the California League of Municipalities, they unanimously supported a resolution calling for abolishing the new independent Civil Defense Agency and placing its powers in the Department of Defense. Putting control in the hands of the military is opposed by most thinking observers, including Generals Marshall and Omar Bradley, and the mayors' resolution seemed mainly a gesture of exasperation and spite. But the AMA's other big point, that the federal agency should work directly with city governments rather than through the state governments and their often rurally-dominated legislatures, has more merit. Mrs. Dorothy McCullough Lee, Mayor of Portland, Oregon, pointed out that it had taken five weeks for a vital directive to reach her under the present system, by which all communication is channeled through state civil-defense authorities. But only Fiorello LaGuardia, head of the Office of Civil Defense during the latter part of World War II, successfully bucked the traditional pattern by which federal agencies work through the states, the patronage units preferred by Congress.

Meanwhile the shelters, the emergency equipment and the stand-by organization for handling a potential attack moved one step nearer materialization with the presentation to Congress of CDA's $3.1-billion program, scheduled to be complete by 1953. Costs are to be borne about equally by federal and local governments, with the former providing critical materials and helping finance the construction of shelters, while the cities are responsible for furnishing additional equipment and administration. Eventually the CDA expects to have 3,000 experts and administrators in Washington and in regional offices; it is asking a small $83-million appropriation this session to get things started. The job is a tremendous one. States must be made conscious of their cities' vulnerability, and cities will have to stretch their facilities and financial resources to be ready for any possible danger.

HERBLOCK IN THE WASHINGTON POST

"How's that again?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Most ordinary Europeans, civilians as well as soldiers, women and children as well as men, have some personal—and unpleasant—experience with the effects of miscalculated military risks. The Second World War was full of them. From the Maginot Line, which was calculated to make and keep the war painlessly phony, to the Ardennes Forest, which brought agony back into its reality, they took a high price in blood and destruction.

A large number of these Europeans, especially in England and France, believe that the "home for Christmas" offensive which Gen. Douglas MacArthur began in North Korea on November 24 was a mistake. When the offensive got under way, MacArthur announced:

> If successful, this should, for all practical purposes, end the war, restore peace and unity to Korea, enable the prompt withdrawal of United Nations military forces and permit the complete assumption by the Korean people and nation of full sovereignty and international equality. It is that for which we fight.

But public opinion in England and France, while accepting these goals, believed they should be served by negotiation as well as by fighting. The legalisms, even the moralities, of the situation did not, in the European view, change the geographical and political fact that the Yalu stands in the same relation to China as the Rio Grande does to the United States. Moreover, the conduct of Syngman Rhee did not seem to justify the notion, implicit in MacArthur's special communique, that the military "liberation" would necessarily coincide with real "liberation" of the Korean people. And although MacArthur was the United Nations commander, the UN Commission which was to take over the administration of North Korea was still cooling its heels in Tokyo.

While the offensive was taking place, even at the start when it seemed to be heading for military success, the newspapers of England and France were full of warnings. Since the major newspapers are careful to avoid embarrassing the relations of the London and Paris governments with Washington, their version of the warnings was reporting the worries of "diplomats at Lake Success," about "the lack of co-ordination between the activities of MacArthur and the activities of the United Nations." It was quite plain, however, that the diplomats mentioned were in fact statesmen far closer home.

When the offensive failed, the effect on public opinion was to make a gulf, between the peoples of Western Europe and the US Government, wider than has existed at any time since the end of the war. For it seemed plain that MacArthur, rather than acting on his own initiative, was now carrying out a policy close to that of the "China Lobby," and the move toward bombing beyond the Yalu appeared to be only a way station on the road toward atom bombing and preventive war. The vague worries became a concrete question, asked in one form or another by large numbers of Englishmen and Frenchmen. Has the United States the right to take military risks — calculated unilaterally, without prior consultation — with the real capital of collective security, the prestige and possibilities of success of the United Nations.

Behind the question was the statement published in London and Paris on the morrow of the American request that the UN act against Chinese-Communist aggression, that neither the Government of France nor that of Great Britain had been consulted in advance. The day before, French Premier René Pleven had discussed the situation with Sir Oliver Harvey, the British Ambassador in Paris, and they had talked only about concerted action in favoring a North Korean buffer area.

The conservative *Figaro* of Paris, consistently and vigorously pro-American, wrote:

> The success of the [MacArthur] offensive might have been useful. Its failure, even partial or temporary, is, in the opinion of very many persons at Lake Success, the worst service which might have been rendered to the United Nations by the commander-in-chief of its armed forces.

The strongly anti-Communist Left Wing *Franc-Tireur* wrote:

> If the fate of the United Nations and the lives of so many men were not at stake, one could rejoice over the painful lesson which has been given to MacArthur. . . . Was it really urgently necessary for MacArthur to try to capture the strip of soil which is precisely the subject matter of diplomatic negotiations? . . . If the American protest is carried to its extreme consequences, it is hard to see how sanctions against China can solve the problem. If there are 200,000 "volunteers" now, there may be two million in the future despite air raids on China. Only the Kremlin would profit in Europe from a conflict which involves the West in Asia. Moreover, Korea would be lost. And would America be followed further by the Europeans? The essential point now is the need to save both the peace and the United Nations. To do this, we should neither capitulate to Sino-Soviet blackmail, nor sacrifice to considerations of prestige the possibilities of settling a Korean problem which is intimately tied up with the whole Asiatic problem.

The Manchester *Guardian* can warn the Western world of the danger of letting Mao Tse-tung capture the imagination of the peoples of Asia:

> In the last three decades it was supposed that it was the ideals of Gandhi which might touch the popular imagination of Asia: the danger is that it may instead be won by the disastrous ideas of Mao and Stalin.

Among the Western Europeans, Mao is not considered a hero; but he profits by the steadily increasing tendency to regard MacArthur as a villain. And the vacillation of American policy between support of Fourth-Pointism and MacArthurian militarism gives emphasis to the remark made recently by Gen. George C. Marshall at Fort Benning, Ga.:

> The history of national defense in this country has been a succession of feasts and famines that have followed each other in demoralizing sequence. . . . I fear that we have given a demonstration somewhat of emotional instability.

PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FRUSTRATION OF UNIFICATION

WESTERN EUROPE is calling up General Eisenhower to organize its defense. Standing fourth down in a chain of shadow commands, he will lead a non-existent armed force. As he sets out, he will find that virtually nothing has been achieved in two years for Europe's defense; and that the lack of progress is the result, less of selfishness or complacency than of an underlying political anarchy in the relations of Western European nations. He will find that US aid has treated the symptoms, not the causes, of Europe's decay.

The European governments will not be able to raise adequate separate contingents to offer the Supreme Commander. And if those separate contingents could be raised they would lack the morale that could counter aggression. Morale will flow from the conviction that the economic and political institutions of a society are worth defending because they foster large freedom, economic growth, a better life. Only a European federation can offer those prospects today.

The economic basis of federation has been partially established by the OEEC. Its achievements in the field of unification as such are limited to the creation of the Economic Payments Union. It is a necessary first step toward the ultimate establishment of a single, large, competitive West European home market within which goods and currencies can freely move. As a result of the multilateral-payments clearings and credit facilities provided by the EPU, the member countries have removed a part of the import and export quotas on their trade with one another. But protective tariffs, restrictions on capital movements and a hard core of protectionist-quota restrictions remain.

Still more important, economic arrangements like the EPU are incapable of inspiring hope or evoking mass enthusiasm, for they operate inconspicuously, and are hard to understand. They have only the most indirect effects, however important, on the lives of ordinary people. For these reasons the Council of Europe would be much more likely to serve as a rallying center for new popular loyalties. Consisting of a Council of Ministers and a Consultative Assembly, it is modeled after the bicameral arrangements of European parliaments, its sessions are open to the public, and it is theoretically free to debate a wide range of political and social problems of interest to the ordinary citizen. The Consultative Assembly, which numbers among its members the champions of European federation, has waged a largely unsuccessful battle with the Council of Ministers for permission to discuss the really important issues facing Western Europe. Though many of its members wish to convert it into a true legislative body as quickly as possible, the Council of Europe still remains a rather disorganized forum for the discussion of such relatively innocuous problems as the ministers are willing to refer to it. Neither the EPU nor the Council of Europe represents any decisive advance toward unification.

Yet, it is not because of popular opposition that such slow progress has been made toward European union. That is indicated by a recent public-opinion survey in the Marshall Plan countries conducted just before the outbreak of the Korean War by the European Movement and the American Committee on United Europe. To the question, "Generally speaking, are you in favor of the idea of Western European Union?" the answers in only two countries, Norway and Denmark, yielded percentages of less than half in favor. In Italy 51 percent, in Germany 55 percent, in France 56 percent, in the Low Countries 57 to 60 percent were in favor of union, while only in France, where 12 percent were opposed, were more than 10 percent of those queried against union. Even in Great Britain 51 percent were in favor and 40 percent were still undecided, while only 9 percent were actively opposed.

What have been the obstacles which have hindered greater progress? Those to which European officials and their American sympathizers love to point are well known and would be admittedly valid if Europe were not now facing the supreme crisis of its modern history. Predominantly socialist Scandinavia is reluctant to join with relatively free-enterprise Belgium, France and Italy. The Protestant North and the Catholic South are suspicious of each other. It would be difficult to federate constitutional monarchies and republics. There are important language differences. Yet these examples of the diversity of individual European societies are superficial compared with the fundamental homogeneity of European culture. Regardless of contemporary differences in religion, language, government and economic philosophy, Western Europe's basic institutions and traditions are the same and share a common and binding historical development since antiquity. Industrial organization, productive methods, commercial and financial institutions and manner of doing business are the same from Norway to Sicily; parliamentary systems, democratic

This is the second in a series of three editorial articles dealing with the crisis in Europe. The third will discuss "A Constructive Foreign Policy for Europe."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberties and individual freedom are, more or less, identical throughout the area. Beneath national differences, there is a profound and uniform European character, both in artistic and intellectual life and in the manner of living and thinking of ordinary people. The essential unity of West European culture is far greater than its national separateness.

There are, of course, other obstacles to unification. High-cost industrial and agricultural producers fear the competition of more productive rivals; wage earners dread the influx of cheaper labor, particularly from regions with large-scale unemployment like Italy and Germany; national bureaucrats are unwilling to lose their functions and see their authority diminish through the growth of new supra-national agencies; existing national parliaments would hate to be relegated to a provincial role in a federated Europe. Within each country, influential and articulate groups are active whose short-term interests would undoubtedly be adversely affected by union however much they stood to benefit in the longer run from the greater security and opportunity which it would provide. But even without the pressure of the world crisis, there is little doubt that the opposition of many of these groups could be overcome or neutralized by temporary concessions to their short-term interests, by economic assistance for re-adjustment purposes, and by the skillful mobilization of powerful public opinion.

A classic example of the successful application of this process is the Schuman Plan which promises to be the most important and dramatic step yet taken toward European unification. Proposed last spring before the Korean War by the French Government and now in its final negotiating stages, the Schuman Plan provides for the creation in effect of a single coal and steel industry covering France, Germany, Italy and the Low Countries. After a transition period and the provision of re-adjustment and technological assistance to high cost, inefficient producers and their workers, the products of the coal and steel establishments of the area would be freely and competitively sold in any of the member countries. An independent and supra-national High Authority, responsible to a new European "Parliament" composed of representatives of national parliaments, would be established to supervise and regulate the unified industries. A European court would also be organized to hear appeals from the decisions of the High Authority. Probably the most significant aspect of the Schuman Plan is the inclusion of Germany as a full and equal member. Determined efforts, reasonable concessions, adequate re-adjustment assistance, skillful publicity and, by no means unimportant, the general encouragement and promise of financial assistance by the United States have all contributed to the success of the Schuman Plan negotiations without necessitating the abandonment of any vital principle.

The Schuman Plan will carry Europe far toward economic union. It will not provide the institutional arrangements and the rallying center for popular loyalties required in the deepening crisis of the post-Korean period. No government has recognized this more clearly than the French. The French Government is fully alive to the extreme danger of France's present defenselessness and the terrible fact that it lacks the prestige and authority necessary to mobilize French resources and manpower for rearmament. It knows that neither American aid nor the further elaboration of the consultative committee arrangements of NATO can arouse popular enthusiasm in France or create the material and psychological strength needed for an effective self-defense. It recognizes the necessity for German rearmament if Western Europe is to be defended, and it knows that it would be both provocative and unproductive to propose the re-establishment of a national German army. The only way in which the Germans can be induced to rearm *for the defense of Western Europe* rather than for their own national purposes is to treat them as equal partners in a truly European effort.

Since the summer, the French Government has worked out a series of related military, political and economic proposals which are known as the Pleven Plan after the present French Prime Minister. In its most recent form, the Pleven Plan envisages the formation of a truly unified European army, composed of continental contingents including German units, responsible to a European Defense Minister and financed by a common military budget levied upon the member governments by a European "Parliament" consisting of representatives drawn from national parliaments, presumably the same legislative body as would supervise the Schuman Plan. The European (continental) army would be under the jurisdiction of the NATO Supreme Commander in the same way and to the same extent as the American and British contingents.

If the Pleven Plan is accepted by the other continental nations in anything like its present form, it is probably capable of making the essential difference between continued national paralysis and the beginning of the regeneration of European society and morale. The specific features of the Pleven Plan are in themselves far-reaching and drastic; moreover, the successful implementation of the French proposals will inevitably require much further and faster progress toward union, especially in the political and economic fields. The French already envisage the early necessity for merging the Pleven Plan institutions with those of the Schuman Plan and possibly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the EPU. The European Defense Ministry and the Schuman Plan's High Authority would then be the nucleus of a European executive, with the European "Parliament" and the European court forming an embryonic but authoritative European legislature and judiciary. The EPU could then begin to provide rudimentary central-banking services and the Council of Europe could either be abolished or merged into this new framework. Such a supra-national institutional framework for the continent, covering the military, political and economic fields and possessed of the required executive, legislative and judicial competence and authority, would certainly stand a better chance of rallying popular loyalties and infusing a willingness to sacrifice and the will to fight than would any other proposal hitherto made.

Yet the prospects for acceptance of the Pleven Plan are not particularly good at the moment. It is generally known on the Continent that the US Government has refused to consider seriously the economic and political features of the French proposals and has only recently and reluctantly agreed that the French might attempt to organize a European army as the only way of obtaining French consent to German rearmament. As the history of the EPU and Schuman Plan negotiations so conclusively demonstrates, it takes not just American acquiescence but strong, persistent and conspicuous American initiative and leadership to induce or compel the weak, disorganized continental governments to agree to anything more than token steps toward unification.

It would be misleading to think that the French initiative in proposing the Schuman and Pleven Plans results from the strength and determination of the French Government and people. Quite the contrary. Like Churchill's offer of Anglo-French Union in the last dark days before the fall of France in 1940, these drastic proposals are born of the very desperation and weakness of the current French situation. They are no less sincere for that reason and there is no evidence for believing that the French Government is not prepared to stand fully behind them. But the fact remains that continental governments today no longer possess the authority, prestige and unity needed for carrying out by themselves the necessarily drastic reorganization of European society. One might almost argue that, if they did, it would be proof that such a reorganization was not in fact required.

The "missing component," to borrow Secretary Acheson's phrase, necessary to make Western Europe really defensible is therefore not only US dollar aid, as the Secretary declared, but a clear, consistent and long-term US Government program of what it wants the Europeans to do and a determined effort to help the Europeans to do it. Without such positive and articulate American leadership for European union, it is unlikely that real progress can be expected toward making Western Europe defensible.

Why the US Government has so far failed to provide this leadership and what possible arrangements might overcome our continued reluctance to do so will be the subject of the concluding article in this series.

"SAY NOT THAT THOUSANDS ARE GONE"

The United States suffered a heavy defeat in Korea. It was insignificant compared to the setbacks suffered in 1776 to bring this nation into being. Among the little band of patriots, defeated in Long Island, defeated in New Jersey, retreating across Pennsylvania, was Tom Paine. Seated by a campfire near Newark he wrote the "American Crisis." Washington ordered it read to his men before they turned back to face the blizzards, the floes and the cold currents of the Delaware on Christmas Eve. Parts of it read well today.

"'TIS SURPRISING to see how rapidly a panic will sometimes run through a country. All nations and ages have been subject to them. Britain has trembled like an ague at the report of a French fleet of flat-bottomed boats; and in the fourteenth century the whole English army, after ravaging the kingdom of France, was driven back like men petrified with fear; and this brave exploit was performed by a few broken forces collected and headed by a woman, Joan of Arc. Would that heaven might inspire some Jersey maid to spirit up her countrymen, and save her fair fellow sufferers from ravage and ravishment! Yet panics, in some cases, have their uses; they produce as much good as hurt. Their duration is always short; the mind soon grows through them, and acquires a firmer habit than before. But their peculiar advantage is, that they are the touchstones of sincerity and hypocrisy, and bring things and men to light, which might otherwise have lain forever undiscovered. In fact, they have the same effect on secret traitors, which an imaginary apparition would have upon a private murderer. They sift out the hidden thoughts of man, and hold them up in public to the world. Many a disguised Tory has lately shown his head, that shall penitentially solemnize with curses the day on which Howe arrived upon the Delaware.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"As I was with the troops at Fort Lee and marched with them to the edge of Pennsylvania, I am well acquainted with many circumstances, which those who live at a distance know but little or nothing of. Our situation there was exceedingly cramped, the place being a narrow neck of land between the North River and the Hackensack. Our force was inconsiderable, being not one-fourth so great as Howe could bring against us. We had no army at hand to have relieved the garrison, had we shut ourselves up and stood on our defence. Our ammunition, light artillery, and the best part of our stores, had been removed, on the apprehension that Howe would endeavor to penetrate the Jerseys, in which case Fort Lee could be of no use to us; for it must occur to every thinking man, whether in the army or not, that these kind of field forts are only for temporary purposes, and last in use no longer than the enemy directs his forces against the particular object which such forts are raised to defend. Such was our situation and condition at Fort Lee on the morning of the 20th of November, when an officer arrived with information that the enemy with 200 boats had landed about seven miles above. . . .

"I shall not now attempt to give all the particulars of our retreat to the Delaware; suffice it for the present to say, that both officers and men, though greatly harassed and fatigued, frequently without rest, covering, or provision, the inevitable consequences of a long retreat, bore it with a manly and martial spirit. All their wishes centered in one, which was, that the country would turn out and help them to drive the enemy back. . . .

"America did not, nor does not want force; but she wanted a proper application of that force. Wisdom is not the purchase of a day, and it is no wonder that we should err at the first setting off. From an excess of tenderness, we were unwilling to raise an army, and trusted our cause to the temporary defence of a well-meaning militia. A summer's experience has now taught us better; yet with those troops, while they were collected, we were able to set bounds to the progress of the enemy, and, thank God! they are again assembling. I always considered militia as the best troops in the world for a sudden exertion, but they will not do for a long campaign.

". . . I call not upon a few, but upon all: not on *this* state or *that* state, but on *every* state: up and help us; lay your shoulders to the wheel; better have too much force than too little, when so great an object is at stake. Let it be told to the future world, that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive, that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet and to repulse it. Say not that thousands are gone, turn out your tens of thousands; throw not the burden of the day upon Providence, but '*show your faith by your works*', that God may bless you. It matters not where you live, or what rank of life you hold, the evil or the blessing will reach you all. The far and the near, the home counties and the back, the rich and the poor, will suffer or rejoice alike. The heart that feels not now is dead; the blood of his children will curse his cowardice, who shrinks back at a time when a little might have saved the whole, and made *them* happy. I love the man that can smile in trouble, that can gather strength from distress, and grow brave by reflection. 'Tis the business of little minds to shrink; but he whose heart is firm, and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death. My own line of reasoning is to myself as straight and clear as a ray of light. Not all the treasures of the world, so far as I believe, could have induced me to support an offensive war, for I think it murder; but if a thief breaks into my house, burns and destroys my property, and kills or threatens to kill me, or those that are in it, and to '*bind me in all cases whatsoever*' to his absolute will, am I to suffer it? . . .

"I thank God, that I fear not. I see no real cause for fear. I know our situation well, and can see the way out of it. While our army was collected, Howe dared not risk a battle; and it is no credit to him that he decamped from the White Plains and waited a mean opportunity to ravage the defenceless Jerseys; but it is great credit to us, that, with a handful of men, we sustained an orderly retreat for near an hundred miles, brought off our ammunition, all our field pieces, the greatest part of our stores, and had four rivers to pass. None can say that our retreat was precipitate, for we were near three weeks in performing it, that the country might have time to come in. Twice we marched back to meet the enemy, and remained out till dark. The sign of fear was not seen in our camp, and had not some of the cowardly and disaffected inhabitants spread false alarms through the country, the Jerseys had never been ravaged. Once more we are again collected and collecting; our new army at both ends of the continent is recruiting fast, and we shall be able to open the next campaign with sixty thousand men, well armed and clothed. This is our situation, and who will may know it. By perseverance and fortitude we have the prospect of a glorious issue; by cowardice and submission, the sad choice of a variety of evils—a ravaged country—a depopulated city—habitations without safety, and slavery without hope—our homes turned into barracks and bawdy-houses for Hessians, and a future race to provide for, whose fathers we shall doubt of. Look on this picture and weep over it! and if there yet remains one thoughtless wretch who believes it not, let him suffer it unlamented."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CASE HISTORY OF A SMEAR

by Arnold Heidenheimer

A MONTH or so ago two old acquaintances met for lunch in Washington. They discussed the request of General Marshall for the appointment of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg as his Assistant Secretary of Defense. Others were interested in Mrs. Rosenberg as the first woman to be recommended for a high defense post. The two friends, Gerald L. K. Smith and Benjamin Freedman, were less concerned with her sex than with her religion.

The two were joined, as Freedman later told a Senate Committee, by common aims. They agreed on a common plan. When lunch was over, Freedman, the apostate Jew who had once arranged for shipments of machine guns to the Mufti, returned to New York. Smith, the oldtime anti-Semitic agitator and fascist, went to work. Soon Smith telephoned Freedman to tell him that he was sending up two men who wanted the dirt on Anna Rosenberg. He implied, so Freedman testified, that they were official Senate investigators. When they arrived in the middle of the night, however, one identified himself as Don Surine, special investigator for Sen. Joseph McCarthy, the other, as Edward Nellor, leg man for Fulton Lewis Jr.

After this meeting Freedman returned to Washington. From the office of Rep. John Rankin he sent a letter to all Senators on the Armed Services Committee volunteering sworn affidavits to prove that Mrs. Anna Rosenberg was a former Communist and a member of the John Reed Club in New York during the thirties. At the same time Fulton Lewis Jr. began a series of broadcasts predicting that the Rosenberg case would loom larger than the Hiss affair as proof of Communist infiltration in Washington.

The Senate Armed Services Committee had approved her appointment on November 29 after a brief hearing. But with the cries of Fulton Lewis Jr., victor over their defeated Chairman Millard Tydings, ringing in their ears, the Senators rushed to re-open the case in a series of closed-door meetings arranged for Freedman and the "witnesses" he had sworn would back him up, which was to mean Ralph De Sola, a former fanatical Communist of Sephardic Jewish background, who had violently turned against his past.

Even before Freedman's initial appearance before the Committee, the anti-Semitic press all over the country went into action with screaming headlines. The "Jewish conspiracy" became symbolized in Anna Rosenberg, who had come to this country from Hungary in 1912 and become one of our outstanding experts on labor relations. Leading the pack was Conde McGinley's *Common Sense,* which had been saved from bankruptcy by Freedman himself when McGinley earlier this year was hauled into a New Jersey court for resisting the execution of judgment for non-payment of debts. *Common Sense* switched from headlines on "YIDDISH MARXISTS PLOT USA DEFEAT BY USSR" to shouting about Mrs. Rosenberg's coming from the heart of the "Eastern European Yiddish population" and alleging that she was guilty of repeated subversive activities in the thirties. Other hate-sheets took the cue. The "Newsletter," put out in Los Angeles by Robert H. Williams, who still holds a reserve status in the Army Intelligence, devoted several issues to Mrs. Rosenberg. Forrest C. Sammons' West Virginia Anti-Communist League dropped its promotion of the "Protocols of Zion" to join the campaign. So did the various front organizations of Gerald L. K. Smith who, in a letter to his backers, claimed sole credit for "getting" Mrs. Rosenberg.

Freedman's appearance before the Senate Committee was no novel experience to him. In addition to testifying before Congress on his tie-up with the Committee for Constitutional Government, he has made frequent court appearances—their high point being a suit he brought against Bernard Baruch, Senator Lehman and Thomas Watson, president of International Business Machines, for conspiring with Cardinal Spellman to keep him out of the Catholic Church. Freedman's star witness, Ralph De Sola, was also no newcomer to the witness stand. Testifying against his former Communist comrades has been one of his major activities since 1939, although his latest endeavors have been in the musical columns of *The Freeman.*

Ralph De Sola's testimony before the Committee had consistency and harmony. With a zeal which caused Sen. Wayne Morse (R, Ore.), who holds an MA in clinical psychiatry, to call him "one of the most extreme paranoiacs I have ever seen," De Sola went to work.

"I, Ralph De Sola," he stated in an affidavit, submitted by Freedman, that paralleled his testimony, "solemnly swear and affirm that I was a member of the Communist Party of the USA. . . . I was recruited by James Magraw . . . in his company I met Anna Rosenberg and he advised me that this outstanding social worker was a Party member, but like many important comrades was kept out of general activity that might expose her to enemies of the Communist Party."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Later, De Sola stated he was told to forget the names of "early Party contacts such as Anna Rosenberg . . . as the Communist Party had most important work for these top comrades." De Sola added that he would provide witnesses who would corroborate his testimony. To substantiate his statements, clippings from the *Daily Worker* and other New York newspapers were introduced, which cited *an* Anna Rosenberg as having signed John Reed literature and at another time being arrested by New Jersey police in the course of a radical fracas.

The present New York postal directory lists 43 Mrs. Anna Rosenbergs in that city alone. Was the John Reed signer, Anna Rosenberg, the woman whose confirmation was now before the Senate? De Sola swore that she was, and superficial appearances seemed to bear out Fulton Lewis' anticipation of another "Hiss trial."

On the following day Mrs. Rosenberg left her Pentagon office, next door to Secretary Marshall's, to face her accuser. She flatly denied ever having seen him before, and later told newsmen, "I didn't believe that anyone who has lived the way I have, who has worked the way I have, could be accused in such a way by a man who admits he was a Communist." Even unfriendly acquaintances of hers thought it unthinkable that a shrewd and ambitious woman who was then deputy director of Gen. Hugh Johnson's NRA, and looking ahead, would be indiscreet enough to engage in Communist activity.

But still it was Mrs. Rosenberg's word against 'his.'

Tydings after all was packing his bags down the hall, and McCarthy's aide was coaching the accusers. Chairman Russell announced that the "question of mistaken identity is not completely eliminated."

The next witness was Helen Winner, De Sola's ex-wife. Her main contribution was to give further background to Senator Morse's analysis of De Sola. He was, she said, completely unstable, and haunted by a mother complex which caused him to blame women, especially successful women, for his own shortcomings. Miss Winner reportedly asked the Chairman to keep her remarks secret as she feared reprisals by De Sola on herself and her children. She described him as a person who goes "to great extremes" for what he regards as "noble reasons." As a former fervent Communist and feature editor of the *Worker* she had been with De Sola at many party gatherings, but she denied categorically that she had ever seen Mrs. Rosenberg at any of these.

This concluded the fourth day the Committee had looked into the matter. When hearings resumed Monday, Freedman stuck to his guns in further testimony before the Committee. Senator Morse's statement that there "appeared to be some organized anti-Semitic forces" behind the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg was the first public hint of the real character of the locked-door proceedings. Some interesting links between Freedman and De Sola also came to the front. Most often mentioned was Hallan Richardson, former attorney for the Yorkville Nazi, Joe McWilliams. Richardson had been Freedman's attorney in the cases arising out of his support of the Mufti, and he had also been interested in yet another committee which De Sola helped organize to press a suit against the Metropolitan Opera Company, the American Broadcasting Company and the Texas Oil Company for their part in the production of Verdi's opera "Don Carlo," which De Sola's group branded as inciting revolution by musical means.

The test of Freedman's and De Sola's repeated accusations came on Tuesday when the Committee heard J. B. Matthews, former investigator for the Un-American Activities Committee, deny the role Freedman had tried to assign him. He said that Freedman had been pestering him to testify because he had once stated that Theodore Kirkpatrick, publisher of *Counter-Attack*, had told him that according to William Harris, a former FBI informer, Anna Rosenberg was a Communist. Matthews, and all the others in the smear link, were to testify that the case was one of "mistaken identity."

The next witness was James Magraw, a rambunctious Irishman who had been De Sola's boss in the WPA writer's project during the late 30's. With not too much academic background, he had, in 1939, refused to give an immediate approval to a book on snakes that De Sola had prepared for publication. Disgruntled, De Sola quit and shortly afterwards testified against Magraw in a subsequent Congressional investigation into Communism in WPA. Magraw also testified that he had never seen Mrs. Rosenberg at functions cited by De Sola.

By now the case was crumbling so fast that there was a rush to leave the snake expert in the pit which he had dug. Fulton Lewis suddenly discovered that the attack on Mrs. Rosenberg had anti-Semitic connotations and evil sources, and indignantly condemned those involved.

On Thursday the Committee was called together once more to listen to yet another witness, George Starr, a former FBI man cited by De Sola. His testimony added to the long string of denials. That morning the Committee also received another communication from Freedman. He now wanted to file some new testimony. Simultaneously he told the *World-Telegram's* Fred Woltman in New York that he was putting up $10,000 to clear the Mrs. Rosenberg and to help advertise for the "other woman" to come forward to clear her. "Otherwise," he declared, "this unfair charge will be hanging over her head. I think it is terrible. It's disgraceful that the FBI hasn't produced this other woman." The same day the Committee passed on the nomination, 13 to 0.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *MacArthur Home for Christmas*

ABRAHAM LINCOLN constantly exchanged worse generals for better ones during the Civil War. Otherwise, he would have failed in his duty to the people. He re-shuffled until, in Ulysses S. Grant, he found a man equal to the task of restoring peace. What was Lincoln's duty is President Truman's. General MacArthur, all things considered, has failed in Korea. The heroic soldiers and marines who chased the MacArthur *ignis fatuus* to the border of Manchuria should not pay the entire cost.

There was no absurd Stassen or Knowland to demand, after McClellan had been routed at Bull Run, that Lincoln should recognize him as the supreme commander. Yet, today, these and other political and newspaper hysterics are shouting to President Truman to abandon his authority and give General MacArthur *carte blanche* to determine foreign and military policy in the Far East. Could asininity go further? Behind the smoke screen of the pro-MacArthur newspaper chains of Hearst, Roy Howard and Bertie McCormick, nondescripts in and out of Congress are demanding that the President violate the Constitution by delegating non-delegable powers to the man who failed in the Philippines, who was badly informed—if informed at all—when South Korea was invaded and who is responsible for the worst defeat in American military history. At tremendous human sacrifice he attempted to surround the Chinese-Communist hosts in North Korea; instead; they surrounded his armies and sent them plunging back over the roads which they had but recently trod as triumphant victors. To be sure, there was one brilliant interlude for which MacArthur has already been given high credit. But that one stroke which drove the North Koreans out of Pyongyang was more than matched by the rout of the UN armies with terrific casualties. US prestige has been damaged to an extent that will be difficult to rebuild.

It is an immutable law of life, and a just one, that he who makes a mistake, even if honestly, shall pay the penalty. MacArthur's grievous fault should be expiated, at least in part, by himself. The total debt should not be imposed upon bereaved widows and orphans and parents to pay in the cruel coinage of war—death and mutilation and torture in prison stockades. This is especially true since MacArthur ignored warnings by apprehensive superiors that what, if successful, might be a glorious adventure, might, if unsuccessful, be an inglorious defeat except as it might be relieved by the deathless heroism of UN soldiers battering their way out of the entrapment in which MacArthur's orders snared them. Even the British and the French governments unofficially suggested the dangers involved to ennuied State Department officials. If these cautions were forwarded to MacArthur, they, too, were given no heed. As usual, MacArthur was all-knowing.

MacArthur might have defended Korea. He chose to attack. Greater glory might lie that way. He committed the colossal blunder of dividing his forces in half, sending one army northeast and the other northwest, with a wide gap of difficult but undefended terrain between. It was through this inviting gap that the Chinese struck with great power and in overwhelming numbers. The tragic and precipitate katabasis of the UN troops is still being written in blood and tears and tragic sufferings.

MacArthur refused to listen to doubts raised by the CIA, based upon information that that organization had and which MacArthur apparently neither had nor cared about. His Chief of Intelligence, upon whom he implicitly relied because he was first and foremost a MacArthur idolator, was Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby who, significantly, was also MacArthur's reservoir of knowledge and fount of military wisdom during the unfortunate Philippines campaign immediately following Pearl Harbor. It was because he relied upon General Willoughby's misinformation and his own godlike qualities when the North Koreans invaded South Korea that MacArthur was so unready there—as unready, in fact, as were the Departments of State and of Defense in Washington. At this early stage of the war, we narrowly escaped annihilation because MacArthur's "Chief of Intelligence" had no intelligence of which he could be chief. However, General Willoughby could be, and was, second only to MacArthur in arrogance and self-importance. Yet, to this same Willoughby was entrusted the duty, to the contemptuous exclusion of all others, of keeping MacArthur informed on what the Chinese Communists were doing or might attempt. This pretentious General, to whom history will doubtless assign his proper niche, should also feel the weight of the righteous anger of President Truman.

General MacArthur boasted that he would have American soldiers home by Christmas. It is to be hoped that, in any event, President Truman will bring MacArthur and Willoughby home by Christmas. And they should stay here until some appropriate Congressional committee can make a full and objective investigation, not only of the events leading up to the Korean debacle, but of the reasons for the failure of MacArthur in the Philippines.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

CHURCHILL: THE MARLBOROUGH OF OUR AGE

by James R. Newman

IN THESE worst of times, Winston Churchill's memoirs both distract us from anxieties and provoke a fresh string of gloomy reflections. We are reminded of better days; mixed, to be sure—full of blunders, defeats, difficulties, bitter struggle; yet sustained by hope, guided by rational goals and fortified by victories. The burdens lay on men who could carry them. The world's fate was not exclusively in the hands of knaves and noble blockheads.

THE HINGE OF FATE, by Winston Churchill (Houghton Mifflin; $6).

The fourth volume of Churchill's memoirs covers the period from the Malay campaign, at the beginning of 1942, to the final victory in Tunis and the liberation of Africa in May, 1943. It is a history of campaigns and of diplomatic negotiations. At least half of the story is told, as we have now come to expect, in Churchill's minutes, memoranda, cables, directives. Though these impede the narrative, they are of prime historical importance; and in *The Hinge of Fate* Churchill has undoubtedly resumed his literary stride. Unlike *The Grand Alliance*, it masters the complex technical task of presenting smoothly the great events occurring simultaneously in different parts of the world. The narrative unfolds naturally, and Churchill's qualities as chronicler, dramatist and ironist are displayed as fully as are his immense capabilities and zest for politics and diplomacy. It cannot be said that in these pages the temptation to historize with benefit of hindsight has been successfully resisted; nor that Churchill has grown more modest; nor that he has come to regret a single view ever expressed or a single action taken. I incline to think, however, that some of these features became more acceptable in *The Hinge of Fate*; perhaps contemporary events strengthen the justification for his outrageous self-esteem.

It is a majestic and panoramic account, wonderfully organized, but the answers to many nagging historical questions and obscurities of the period are disappointingly few. The disaster at Singapore—"the largest capitulation of British history"—is described but inadequately explained. General Auchinleck could fight nothing but set-piece battles, and those, despite superiority of manpower and materials, he managed usually to lose. Why was he so long retained as supreme commander in Africa? Neither Eisenhower, Clark nor Roosevelt, nor Churchill for that matter, conducted themselves prettily in their dealings with the contemptible Darlan. The generals may be forgiven for negotiating with a scoundrel on the spot in the interests of expediency; it is a well-known propensity of military leaders, born of their training, and merely points up the folly of granting them authority in political matters. On the other hand, Churchill is unable to tell us why neither he nor the President had thought to arrange matters beforehand so that Darlan would not be needed. There is no merit to Churchill's contention that the Admiral alone had the confidence of the local population; but it is typical of his limited understanding of what the "masses" feel.

Churchill's discussion of the "unconditional surrender" phrase: who originated it, its repercussions (which continue), is elusive. He is obviously skeptical of Elliott Roosevelt's story that when the President used the phrase at a dinner, the Prime Minister "thought, frowned, thought, finally grinned, and at length announced 'Perfect!'" (I should add that Churchill is skeptical of Elliott Roosevelt altogether.) He admits employing the phrase first in a communication to the War Cabinet, but claims to have been surprised on hearing the President use it at a press conference. But he is much too sensible to acquiesce in the familiar claptrap that the phrase "prolonged the war and played into the dictators' hands by driving their peoples . . . to desperation."

One of the disturbing impressions gathered from the book is that Stalin had good reason to believe that Churchill and Roosevelt were procrastinating, if not deliberately duplicitous, regarding the opening of a second front in France. There were qualified promises of a cross-channel invasion in 1942, promises which should never have been given. In January, 1943, and again in March, messages to Stalin from both leaders gave assurance of an invasion in August, September at the latest. The diplomatic interchanges make it evident that Stalin counted heavily on this move and that neither Churchill nor Roosevelt disabused him. Yet it is equally evident from the text and from documents in the appendix that Churchill, as well as Roosevelt, at the very time their cables were sent, regarded the cross-channel operations as impossible for that year. It is much the lesser question whether or not their decision was forced by circumstance; much the greater why they deceived, and thus risked a breach with, their indispensable ally. No doubt they feared and had reason to fear Stalin's reaction, yet at bottom were confident that the Russians would continue to fight. It is not an edifying record.

The high point of the book is Churchill's mission to Moscow. The story is superlatively told and, even allowing that we have only one man's version, both the episode and the account of it add to Churchill's stature. The two men respected each other; they reached, despite—or perhaps because of—strong clashes of will and opinion, a level of grudging personal regard. Their talks had that mixture of bluntness and wiliness, of childishness and maturity that characterizes grand diplomacy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Churchill said everything he wanted to say, as did Stalin; there is no doubt they understood each other perfectly, though neither said everything he meant. (The Prime Minister appreciated the profundity of one of Roosevelt's comments about official Russian utterances: "I am not unduly disturbed about our respective responses or lack of responses from Moscow. I have decided they do not use speech for the same purpose as we do.") Churchill lost his temper and was soothed—it is hard to believe—by Molotov; Stalin lost his and regained it by himself, presumably because none had the temerity to soothe him. During one of their meetings, Churchill made it a point to inform Stalin that in 1920 he had been "very active in the intervention, and I would not want you to think otherwise. He [Stalin] smiled amicably, so I said, 'Have you forgiven me?' 'Premier Stalin, he say,' said Interpreter Pavlov, 'all that is in the past, and the past belongs to God'." There was a final six-hour dinner *en famille* (Stalin, Churchill, Molotov) in Stalin's small four-room flat. Stalin, "to make things go," chaffed Molotov unmercifully, and Churchill got a "splitting headache" ("which for me was very unusual"). The entire meeting was invaluable for future relations among the Allies; one might wish it could be repeated.

It is the role of Marlborough that Churchill so deliberately (and in a sense successfully) strives to relive; and he was, I suspect, happiest in it as the military strategist, the "Captain-General of . . . courage and constancy" (Lord Winterton's phrase) when his country was desperate, alone and in peril. Yet, like Marlborough (and in his preference for foreign affairs over domestic even more like Castlereigh), he is unrivaled in our age as a war statesman and war diplomatist. Like Marlborough he is a Tory; like him he is shrewd, practical, prudent, yet elevated. Like him his concern with humanity is born of principle rather than of sympathy. The complexion of his qualities is uneven, and much that he has done since the war is reprehensible, but not one of the sloganeers who lead us today is fit to wipe Churchill's pens.

PORTRAIT OF MAO

MAO TSE-TUNG: RULER OF RED CHINA, by Robert Payne (Henry Schuman, Inc.; $3.50).

WITH United Nations troops battling Chinese Communist "volunteers" in North Korea, the issue of general war or peace now rests largely in the hands of a man almost wholly unknown in the West. Until recently only a few Americans knew as much as Mao Tse-tung's name; and even today the ruler of Communist China has more shadow than substance outside his own country. Few books could be timelier than one adding to our knowledge of the Chinese Communist chief.

Mao Tse-tung: Ruler of Red China is, unfortunately, not quite such a book. Robert Payne is a gifted author-poet with extensive experience in China; he is a non-Communist who understands the appeal of Communism to Asiatics. His book has the great merit of being neither a diatribe nor a hagiography. It is also highly readable, fluent and assertive. But the ease with which Mr. Payne leads up to his conclusions does not stem from a mastery of his material; there are few pages in his book without a name misspelled, an event misplaced, or a fact misinterpreted. He would have given us greater faith in his accuracy had he avoided misspelling well-known names (such as Bakunin's) and misdating well-known events (such as the death of Yuan Shih-kai).

These errors are symptomatic of the manner in which the author has handled his sources. Many data of Mao Tse-tung's life are, to be sure, far from established; but fortunately we have, in English, Mao's own account, as rendered by Edgar Snow in *Red Star Over China*. This account cannot, of course, be taken at face value; but it provides, by what it says and does not say, material for analysis. A biographer could well begin where Snow left off; but Payne has not made this beginning.

Thus he wholly ignores a crucial event in Mao's life: his fall from party grace, in late 1927, for having violated Comintern discipline. Mao was expelled from his party posts and placed on probation because he had organized rural soviets at a time when Moscow outlawed such activity as "Trotskyism." Mao freely admitted this contretemps in his talk with Snow, but claimed that harmony between him and the hierarchy was soon restored. He then contradicted himself by admitting his subsequent opposition to the regime of Li Li-san, who acted, between 1928 and 1931, as Moscow's chosen instrument in China.

In stating that the Comintern "surrendered its influence" in China as early as 1927, Payne ignores the fact that the Comintern sponsored each change of leadership in the Chinese party between 1927 and 1931. In fact, these years saw a tightening of Russian control over the Chinese Communists; and it was only after the Russian strategy of urban insurrection went bankrupt under Li Li-san that the leadership fell by default to Mao Tse-tung.

The basic fault of Mr. Payne's analysis lies, however, in his failure to place Mao in the Marxist-Leninist tradition. Like Lenin, Mao has widened the empirical base of Marxism without changing its values or aims; that is, he has fitted original action into a given philosophy. Mao's "New Democracy" is not, as Payne claims, an "entirely new political category," nor need its gradualism be traced back to the Fabians. Marx and Lenin proved (in 1848, 1905 and 1921) that gradualism can move to the forefront of their creed.

It is impossible, then, to accept Payne's conclusion that Mao stands closer to Martin Luther than to Stalin. Mao's apostasy was never explicit, and perhaps not even conscious. He broke the Marxian rule that peasants cannot head a revolution; but he broke it in a spirit of expediency, not of rebellion. Mr. Payne's analogy also stumbles over the fact that modern Communism is totalitarian. Political power, to a Luther, was never more than a necessary evil, deprecated even when used; but to a Stalin or a Mao it is, if not an end in itself, at least the end of his particular existence. CONRAD BRANDT

Conrad Brandt, an Army Intelligence officer in China from 1944 to 1946, is working at the Russian Research Center of Harvard on a study of Soviet strategy in China.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POSTSCRIPT AND EPITAPH

G.B.S.: A POSTSCRIPT, by Hesketh Pearson (Harper; $2.75).

HESKETH PEARSON'S enterprise is breath-taking. Shaw died on November 2. In less than two weeks this book was published and on sale, complete with an obituary. Mr. Pearson was evidently primed for the final deadline.

The book is an appendix to Pearson's *G. B. S.: A Full Length Portrait* of 1942, which remains on the whole the best biography of Shaw that has appeared. But "best" in this case means the best story of Shaw's career and personality, for neither in 1942 nor in 1950 was Mr. Pearson the man to give an adequate account of what made Shaw really important—his ideas, art, and share in the serious political, moral and intellectual life of seven decades. Pearson boasts that he knows "nothing whatever about the alleged science of economics." He appears equally contemptuous of politics, philosophy, religion and the other means of building what he sarcastically calls "a nobler and a better world" that concerned Shaw over a lifetime.

Pearson's main purpose in the *Postscript* seems to be to put on record his efforts to hold his own against Shaw's demands and browbeatings, but he also adds details that could not be published while Shaw and certain of his contemporaries were still alive. He tells how Shaw remained a "good totalitarian" to the end ("the only country in the world where you can get real freedom is Russia," he said in 1948; "the greatest man alive is Stalin"); how the rift between Wells and the Fabians was not ideological but due to the "fact that the Webbs had warned Bland and Olivier to advise their daughters to keep clear of Wells, who would try to seduce them"; why Shaw, besides "really disliking" Wilde, was "also jealous" of him; how it was the second Mrs. Granville-Barker's mortal hatred that separated Shaw from one of his best friends; why Shaw quarreled with Jennie Patterson, didn't marry May Morris, didn't dislike Eleanor Marx, didn't respond to Annie Besant ("she had absolutely no sex appeal"), enraged Stella Campbell, failed to keep a date with Isadora Duncan, liked Lady Astor, and made a success of his life with Charlotte Payne-Townshend ("as man and wife we found a new relation in which sex had no part").

Pearson ends by finding Shaw a "great man," but this conclusion is not reached without difficulties and reservations. "His persistence was due to something in his nature which forbade him to admit that he could ever be wrong. He could not go back on his life's work, the issue of which, though resulting in tyranny, mendacity, iron curtains, slavery, and every known form of cruelty, he had hailed as the coming of a new world, *his* world, the civilization for which he had fought. . . . His word was law, to himself no less than to others, and in killing his social conscience he passed on some of his internal discomfort to his fellow creatures." But despite the fact that "nothing short of death could stop Shaw's pen or shut his mouth," Pearson's final verdict is that Shaw's "combination of qualities in one personality" is "unique in history, and will assuredly remain so."

Asked in his last year if he ever missed his old friends, Shaw retorted, "I don't miss anyone except myself." "Yourself?" "The man I used to be." That epitaph is likely to be seconded by everyone who knew and felt his presence and who will feel, for a long time to come, the world a poorer place since he left it.

MORTON DAUWEN ZABEL

Morton Dauwen Zabel is a professor of English at the University of Chicago. He is editor of "The Portable Conrad" and of "Literary Opinion in America," a new and enlarged edition of which is to appear early in 1951.

FICTION PARADE

The House of Breath, by William Goyen (Random House; $2.75).

William Goyen set out to re-create a sensuous and physical world of memory in his first novel, and he has done so. Narrative is not important to this re-creation, but texture is. So are rhythm, tone, the right and evocative detail. There is of course some narrative (reminiscent of the structure in Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*). Eight or nine characters, all members of the same family and house and town (Charity, which is everybody's Winesburg, down in Texas), go back in memory as the I, who holds the book together, goes back in memory to the good gone days, the past, telling what happened. The sum of what happened is decline, loss, grief, dying, age; the book is a kind of autumnal celebration of many dirges, against which is opposed only infrequently the I's affirmation of youth and its erotic questing, its lyrical hope.

But again, it is the tone of the approach to memory that matters, and this tone, a semi-Biblical, semi-folksy rant of grieving, sometimes achieving a pathos just short of theatrical, is made to rise at times to heights operatic, you might say, in rhetorical effect. The world, re-created by memory (and with the Proustian aid of remembered objects that have become symbols), must ring, speak, sing; it must finally create a spell, must enchant.

That is one of the aims of this novel of sensibility: to create a spell, to enchant. Poetry is supposed to do that more than prose. Prose wants to do here what poetry does. And it succeeds.

The Watchful Gods and Other Stories, by Walter Van Tilburg Clark (Random House; $2.75).

The best stories in this book are the more or less outright "nature" stories, and these, on hawks, coyotes, old trappers, water holes, road-runners, hunters, are told with the effortless charm of campfire yarns. Sympathy and intimate knowledge produce warmth and authority. "The Watchful Gods," a novella dealing with the conscience of a young boy who has just killed his first rabbit, does not have the same ease and power. Huge nature, in the Far West, with its savage summits, mighty coast lines and clouds, is to the boy a Jehovah-like force. Having killed, he feels he must propitiate, or be damned. But the boy's endeavors to initiate himself into the moral vision of manhood are described minutely, too minutely, and sentimentality interjects itself between writer and subject. So again, titanic nature, brooding far up in the hills, collects the best writing around it. Clark has a dreamy kind of whimsey—*cf.*, "The Fish Who Could Close His Eyes"—that is humorous and engaging. "The Portable Phonograph," about those days when the Final War will have laid low the world, is interesting because it raises the question: Will it happen?

When Sex meets War is the well-worked theme of *Louisville Saturday*, by Margaret Long (Random House; $2.75). More of a report than a novel, it investigates with racy energy the reactions of some eleven women to as many men in town, on the town, during the early days

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of World War II. Miss Long does not miss much: anti-Semitism, alcoholism, the Lesbian, juvenile delinquency are all noted. It is the face of the novel as it has been lifted by the social-service worker's approach and the cross-section technique. Readable because of its lively topic, warm and relaxed in its feeling for street scenes, family life and the general ruggedness of Americana, it might have been more searching if it had employed the cliché less. The eye operates literally here, and alas, imagination is not asked to transform anything. JEAN GARRIGUE

ON THE AIR: Soap and the Roosevelts

As THE YEAR ends, we begin to see the shape of things to come. Both NBC-TV and CBS-TV will introduce several soap operas in January. A good deal of thought has gone into the blueprinting of these daytime serials. In radio's sudsy parade, the mainstays have been perpetual agony, the cliff-hanger and the psychiatrist's couch. These have been deemed unfit for the visual medium. Here, sweetness and light must predominate, and some humor, even occasional satire, must be added.

The first of the TV serials is "The First Hundred Years," which CBS-TV is broadcasting Monday-through-Friday at 2:30 to advertise Procter & Gamble's Tide. It seems that there is a boy who is about to marry a girl. His father tried hard to tell the son about birds, but the boy has a book that tells about birds. The commercial came through with solid impact. However, I'd have predicted failure for radio's daytime serial if I had been in at its birth. TV may keep "The First Hundred Years" going for at least a century.

Elliott Roosevelt had a break recently. It all started when Mary Margaret McBride suddenly got mad at NBC, where she had established a reputation as "the first lady in radio" by broadcasting for many years over WNBC, the network's New York flagmast. Miss McBride picked up her marbles, including 17 sponsors, and walked across the hall from WNBC to WJZ, which is the key station for the rival ABC chain. Now that hurt not only NBC's pocketbook but also the vanity of its New York manager, Ted Cott. He had to top that "first lady" claim, and he did it by signing Mrs. Roosevelt. And that's where Elliott came in. He is not only a partner in the radio production firm that has charge of his mother's broadcast activities; he is also her announcer, the man who spiels her commercials.

In one day, I listened for three-quarters of an hour to Mrs. Roosevelt's program, and for an equal length of time to Miss McBride. Both bring to their microphones people of prominence; both touch frequently upon important matters; neither talks down to her audience; Mrs. Roosevelt has a slight edge as far as serious topics are concerned. But when the commercials come on the air, the impression made by these two programs is very different. It is one thing to be "the first lady of radio" and quite another to be the person whom most Americans still think of as "the first lady." So far as salesmanship is concerned, the advantage is entirely with Miss McBride. She can, and she does, coerce her "girls" with a straightforward sales talk that no one objects to because she has never pretended to be more than an entertaining saleswoman. But when Elliott reminds listeners that "mother" uses a certain kind of bobby-pin and that further information about a soup may be obtained by dropping a card "to the Roosevelts," he is trading on his name—and on hers. About all that can be said of the performance was put succinctly by June Bundy of the *Billboard*: "The show proves that a boy's best friend is his mother." If Mrs. Roosevelt can stand for Elliott's commercials, I'll get on to my season's greetings:

To Jack Gould, radio-TV editor of the New York *Times*. He set the pace for the opposition to the *Red Channels* mud-slinging mob when they ganged up on actors, writers and directors by having Miss Jean Muir fired. Miss Muir did not get her job back, but Gould's forthright campaign gave courage to many broadcasters who weren't quite sure which way to turn. The *Red Channels* anti-personnel bomb was a dud, thanks largely to Gould.

To George Heller, former national executive secretary of the American Federation of Radio Artists, for his organization of Television Authority and for pushing through the first union contract for talent on television.

To Wayne Coy, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, for fighting the battle on the color-television front and not being afraid to toss the word "Liar" at some people who were taken in tow by the Radio Corporation of America after the FCC had ruled in favor of CBS's color system.

To Frieda Hennock, of the FCC, for leading the way toward reserving some television channels exclusively for educational, non-commercial purposes.

To the United Nations Department of Public Information, particularly its Radio Division, for making television broadcasts direct from Lake Success available to broadcasters. Three TV networks —CBS, ABC and DuMont—now broadcast the UN's television output, and pat themselves on the back for the job. The fact is that these programs cost each network a mere $165 a month for line charges. The real cost is borne by the UN itself, and to its staff goes the credit.

I could go on, and find other people and organizations to applaud. However, everything isn't too sweet. For instance, the National Association of Broadcasters has still not restored its $5,000 subsidy to the Federal Radio Education Committee—though its members spend many millions for advertising and promotion. The television industry itself is spending $2 million on a campaign in which parents are assured that a child needs a TV set at least as much as air and sunshine. Then WPIX, the TV station owned by the New York *Daily News*, has just canceled a series of broadcasts of old Charlie Chaplin shorts. An American Legion post in New Jersey opened its mouth, and WPIX took to the Western hills. Merry Christmas!

SAUL CARSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEATRE: Guys, Dolls, Witches

THERE ARE whole families of witches in the fashionable districts of New York. One of them snares Rex Harrison. For witches, love is only mischief: they may be entertained by sex, but they experience no lasting affection and they shed no tears. John van Druten's witch in "Bell, Book and Candle" succumbs to love for Harrison, loses her fell powers, learns to cry and live on as happily as the rest of us. Do you like this? Yes? No? It makes no critical difference.

I found "Bell, Book and Candle" easy to take, like a small cream puff served to look larger without spoiling the stomach. It is very well served. Though Harrison plays a man limited to ordinary faculties, he is the most bewitching person in the cast—intelligent, deft, debonair, unspeakably attractive—the best of drawing-room comedians. Lilli Palmer has an engaging coolness, like white wine and soda; she wears her clothes delightfully and makes Harrison a most natural partner. The rest of the cast is good, and George Jenkins catches the atmosphere of elegant comfort and semi-bohemian familiarity with admirable scenic rightness.

"Ring Round the Moon" is an exquisitely fluffy comedy spun from very special material. Most of us who write about the theatre have a way of describing the effect of a play without understanding the exact nature of the effect. (Stendhal once pointed out that a pistol shot at a Mozart concert was more "effective" than any of the Symphonies; we are in the position, then, of people who would report the event on the basis of the effective pistol shot rather than on the significance of the music.) A failure to recognize the essential quality of "Ring Round the Moon" is a way of reducing it to a nonexistence it does not deserve.

A Frenchman might call Anouilh, the author of the original from which Christopher Fry made his brilliant adaptation, an anarchist of the Right. Anouilh is both nostalgic and cynical about the past, when wealthy aristocrats could give parties at which a footman might be run through by a haughty guest to the shocked delight of the company. He sees the present as a time when well-to-do society makes a waif and plaything of the artist, when the rich reap little pleasure from their earnings, and love is the last relic in the surrounding devastation. "Every man is quite alone," the dyspeptic millionaire of the play says. "No one can help anyone. He can only go on," and the stage direction reads: "They look straight in front of them, squatting on the ground in the middle of the torn [bank] notes."

"Ring Round the Moon" represents the lyricism of the French postwar epoch, cruel as a serpent's sting, sweet as a chorus girl's kiss, made gay for the sake of decorum, ballet-like for the sake of culture. All this serves Fry's purpose —though he is actually far less bitter and edgy than Anouilh, being an affable Englishman rather than an exasperated Frenchman—providing the material for a brilliant choreographic presentation by London's most gifted young director, Peter Brook.

The London production heightened the effervescent fun and diminished the acid bite, but a feeling of the grim outline of the original remained within the glow of the added glamor. Gilbert Miller understands only the glamor, so that in New York the play is not so much like bitters over sugar as like maple syrup over candy. The sets are an adaptation but not an improvement on Oliver Messel's jewel-like originals; the Dufy drops are fetching without being necessary. The cast—apart from Oscar Karlweis, whose sickly countenance is significant—is only half as happy as the one it replaces.

The musical "Guys and Dolls" is excellent fun because it is replete with its own character. Its matter is a leaf torn from Damon Runyon, jazz-singer of Broadway's neon personalities. Though its book by Jo Swerling and Abe Burrows follows a more consistent story line than most, its chief merit lies in the wisecracks that create the authentic mood of the crazy-smart street the show celebrates. Frank Loesser has a real gift for comic recitative that not only composes a song (often musically indifferent) but a real dramatic communication. A number like "Sue Me" becomes an almost poignant scene in a wonderfully screwy way. The crap-game sequence in the sewer is a beaut, and the cast is a perfect ensemble, with top honors for benzedrine-eloquent Sam Levene, wistful-tough Vivian Blaine and the Cary Grant of 46th Street, Robert Alda. Nor must the gravelly B. S. Pully, Stubby Kaye and Tom Pedi be forgotten. "Guys and Dolls" has a real style for the good reason that it is all of a piece in spirit, substance and craft. HAROLD CLURMAN

MOVIES

Atomic Dragnet

"SEVEN DAYS TO NOON" is a little more than so-so British chase picture that will receive disproportionate attention from the nature of its theme. Professor Willingdon, senior physicist at the Wallingford nuclear-research laboratories, becomes unbalanced by the realization that his life work, dedicated to improving the human community, is about to be used instead for its destruction. One Sunday evening he writes a letter to the Prime Minister, stating that if by noon of the following Sunday the government has not announced its decision to cease the manufacture of atom bombs, he will detonate one of them near the Houses of Parliament and lay London waste from Waterloo Bridge to the outskirts of town. The professor then packs one of his monstrous inventions in a satchel (it is a good deal more destructive and more conveniently portable than the current Los Alamos model is reliably rumored to be) and loses himself in the warrens of London.

Needless to say, the authorities reject the ultimatum, but fearing that they may not come up with Willingdon in time, they resolve to evacuate the city.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fulfillment of this stupendous plan (reported in the fine British documentary style) provides the best moments in the picture. The hunt for the distraught professor, though the center of interest, is rather static. There are a few carefully-staged brushes between quarry and hunters, but the directors, John and Roy Boulting, fail to work up the tension that Hitchcock or Reed would create. Toward Wednesday of the critical week it became so apparent that Willingdon was going to wander around unrecognized until a few minutes before noon on Sunday that I began to wish restlessly that the picture would skip ahead to the inevitable rendezvous. The empty London thoroughfares, unless they are extraordinary models, must have been photographed with the cheerful cooperation of a lot of busy passersby.

Barry Jones was well cast as the sixty-year-old professor; his implacable, suffering eyes and rotunda forehead make him a suitable Wellsian superman. Andre Morell, playing Superintendent Folland of the Special Branch, Scotland Yard, carries the imperturbable, whispering courtesy of British policemen as far as that convention can go short of elegant coma. Sheila Manahan, who in figure more resembles the Queen than she does the popular screen ideal, is the professor's understanding daughter and the fiancée of his worried but colorless assistant (Hugh Cross). Joan Hickson and Olive Sloane play two of those cockney females who are always getting embroiled with desperate men in British thrillers; Ronald Adam, as the Prime Minister, looks like a greengrocer, a strikingly realistic touch.

And this leaves to the last the most important point, which is that, although no one is obliged to adopt the atom bomb as a device for fiction, anyone who does so is under an obligation to handle the subject as fruitfully as his powers of analysis and imagination will permit. "Seven Days to Noon" treats the horror of our time as though it were the familiar stick of dynamite wired to an alarm clock that has been the reliable needle in the haystack of thriller writers for decades. And a mad scientist clutching a volatile satchel and mouthing Biblical imprecations in the small hours of the night is too obvious and unlikely a figment to do more than irritate an audience sick with the knowledge that it has been told to conquer the atom or perish by it.

Classical legends, however subtle in implication, are simple and forthright in form, but when Jean Cocteau gets his hands on one of them it becomes a charade for the worshipers at his shrine of cabalistic allusions. Thus Orpheus, whose history, though it involved some out-of-the-way voyaging and one unwonted accident, was perfectly straightforward, appears in Cocteau's new picture as a youth plagued by a reversible time sequence and forced to walk through mirrors, to struggle up imperceptible hills against impalpable winds and to fall in love with death in the form of what looked to me like Ruritania's most *fatale* secret agent. His mishaps in the hereafter or the once-upon-a-time (I was never quite sure what day it was) also involve a limousine whose radio spouts Maquis code of a kind familiar on the BBC during the war, and twin Mercurys who get around to their body-snatching on motorcycles. It was all too much for me, but I was greatly entertained.

If you cannot always keep up with M. Cocteau in his somewhat chi-chi labyrinth, you can nevertheless enjoy the bric-a-brac he artfully exhibits along the way. His sets are ingenious and elegant and he is fertile with the shocks of incongruity. In "Orpheus," moreover, his actors work with a kind of solid French reasonableness that makes their immediate relationships interesting whatever may be the esoteric significance underlying them. Notably effective in this respect are Jean Marais (Orpheus), François Perier (Heurtebise), Maria Déa (Eurydice) and Maria Cesares (The Princess, Death, or The Death of Orpheus, as the occasion demands). I suspect that Cocteau is spoofing me with his classical-bebop flimflam, but his showmanship is such that I am delighted to drop my jaw for his satisfaction. ROBERT HATCH

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 H ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $5.00.

ANALYSIS BY MAIL $2.00. Available for lectures, parties. Recognized graphologist. **Dorothy Sara, 11 E. 32nd St., N.Y.C.**

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 86S, *Radio City, New York.*

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. **Alln, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.**

LITERARY SERVICE

WRITERS! Book mss. wanted for publication, fiction, non-fiction. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

ORANGES GRAPEFRUIT

JOIN WITH DISCRIMINATING NEW YORKERS who enjoy our INDIAN RIVER oranges and grapefruit! Grand for eating, juice, gifts. Guaranteed. Express prepaid. Bushel $6.00, half bushel $4.00. **James H. Hart, Island Groves, R. 2, Cocoa, Florida.**

PEP

Pamphlets

• **Single copies of the broadsheets issued by Political and Economic Planning (London) may still be purchased from the New Republic for 25¢ cash postpaid. The most recent issues are:**

#312 A New Policy for Housing
#313 Sample Surveys—Part I
#314 Sample Surveys—Part II
#315 South Asia
#316 Town Planning and the Public
#317 Government Spending
#318 Government and Industry
#319 Technological Education

Price 25¢—Order from

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 EAST 49 STREET
New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coming January 8

STATE of the UNION

The THIRD ANNUAL *New Republic*
supplement on the Liberal Program

As the New Year approaches, America takes stock of her past and prepares for the grim necessities of 1951. A new Congress will assemble and the President will address that Congress on the State of the Union.

For the third successive year the *New Republic* will issue a special supplement, paralleling the President's traditional message and defining liberal tasks and liberal goals.

This year the emphasis will be upon our degree of readiness to meet the world crisis, reviewing the US-UN position and contrasting the years 1950 and 1941, which were profoundly different but also disturbingly alike.

The targets for 1951 will be set and an answer attempted to the question: How much growth will be required in the economy and how is it to be brought about?

Uncensored Report from COMMUNIST CHINA

The *New Republic* will shortly begin publication of an important series of articles reporting on conditions inside Communist China today.

Written by a European who very recently came out and whose identity may not be revealed, the series will answer such questions as these:

What is happening to the Chinese peasants who make up the overwhelming majority of the population? To small and middle-sized business? Why is the new Peoples Government protecting most capitalist enterprises for the immediate present? What is happening to the schools, foreign universities, the churches, the press? How are the Chinese Communists finding officials to run the big cities? Who are the people that put advertisements in newspapers pleading guilty to deviations from the party line?

Don't miss this informative series soon to appear.

The NEW REPUBLIC . 40 East 49 . New York 17

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED